

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MICHAEL DARNELL SMITH

*

v.

Civil No. CCB-17-3232

RICHARD D. DOVEY, et al.

*

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Now pending in this case filed by self-represented Maryland prison inmate Michael Smith are his Motion to Compel additional discovery from the defendants (ECF 81); his Motion to Amend complaint (ECF 82); and his “Motion for Directive” (ECF 89). The motions have been fully briefed. My rulings follow.

First, the motion to compel is **Denied**. The answers and responses provided were sufficient within what is reasonable to expect based on a person’s memory of conversations that occurred several years ago, and/or were beyond the scope of the limited discovery permitted by the court’s order entered January 4, 2019. (ECF 69)

Second, the motion to amend is **Granted**, except that no John Does will be added. Smith essentially adds new regulatory references and some additional factual detail without substantially changing the nature of his claims.

Third, the “motion for directive” relating to tracking numbers is **Denied**.

Consistent with the earlier order (ECF 69), the defendants may respond to the amended complaint by refiled motions to dismiss or for summary judgment and may do so within 60 days of the date of this Order.

So Ordered this 11th day of March 2020.

Catherine C. Blake
United States District Judge